

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

v.

VERIANE APARECIDA SOARES-
PEREIRA,

Defendant.

CRIMINAL NO. 16-522 (GAG)

MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
RE: RULE 11(b) GUILTY PLEA HEARING

I. Procedural Background

On August 18, 2016, defendant Veriane Aparecida Soares-Pereira was charged in a one-count indictment. She agrees to plead guilty to that single count.

Count One charges that Ms. Soares, on or about July 30, 2016, being an alien previously deported and removed from the United States, attempted to enter the United States without having obtained prior to her reembarkation at a place outside the United States, the express consent from the Secretary of Homeland Security, to apply for readmission to the United States, all in violation of Title 8, United States Code, Section 1326(a).

Defendant appeared before me, assisted by the court interpreter, on May 9, 2017, since the Rule 11 hearing was referred by the court. See United States v. Woodard, 387 F.3d 1329 (11th Cir. 2004) (magistrate judge had authority to conduct Rule 11 guilty plea hearing with consent of defendant). She was advised of the purpose of the hearing and placed under oath with instructions that her answers must be truthful lest she would subject himself to possible charges of perjury or making a false statement.

USA v. Veriane Aparecida Soares-Pereira
Cr. No. 16-522 (GAG)
Report and Recommendation on Guilty Plea

II. Consent to Proceed Before a Magistrate Judge

Defendant was provided with a Waiver of Right to Trial by Jury form, which she signed.¹ She confirmed that her attorney translated the contents of the waiver form into Spanish. She was advised of the right to hold all proceedings, including the change of plea hearing, before a district court judge. She received an explanation of the differences between the scope of jurisdiction and functions of a district judge and a magistrate judge. She was informed that if she elects to proceed before a magistrate judge, then the magistrate judge will conduct the hearing and prepare a report and recommendation, subject to review and approval of the district judge. The defendant then voluntarily consented to proceed before a magistrate judge.

III. Proceedings Under Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure

Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure governs the acceptance of guilty pleas to federal criminal violations. Pursuant to Rule 11, in order for a plea of guilty to constitute a valid waiver of the defendant's right to trial, the guilty plea must be knowing and voluntary. United States v. Hernandez-Wilson, 186 F.3d 1, 5 (1st Cir. 1999). "Rule 11 was intended to ensure that a defendant who pleads guilty does so with an 'understanding of the nature of the charge and consequences of his plea.'" United States v. Cotal-Crespo, 47 F.3d 1, 4 (1st Cir. 1995) (quoting McCarthy v. United States, 394 U.S. 459, 467 (1969)). There are three core concerns in a Rule 11 proceeding: 1) absence of coercion; 2) understanding of the charges; and 3) knowledge of the consequences of the guilty plea. Cotal-Crespo, 47 F.3d at 4 (citing United States v. Allard, 926 F.2d 1237, 1244 (1st Cir. 1991)).

¹ The form entitled Consent to Proceed Before a United States Magistrate Judge in a Felony Case for Pleading Guilty (Rule 11, Fed.R.Crim.P.) and Waiver of Jury Trial, signed and consented by both parties is made part of the record.

USA v. Veriane Aparecida Soares-Pereira
Cr. No. 16-522 (GAG)
Report and Recommendation on Guilty Plea

A. Competence to Enter a Guilty Plea

This magistrate judge questioned the defendant about her age, education, employment, history of any treatment for mental illness or addiction, use of any medication, drugs, or alcohol, and understanding of the purpose of the hearing, all in order to ascertain her capacity to understand, answer and comprehend the change of plea colloquy. The court confirmed that the defendant received the indictment and fully discussed the charges with her counsel and was satisfied with the advice and representation she received. The court further inquired whether defendant's counsel or counsel for the government had any doubt as to her capacity to plead, receiving answers from both that the defendant was competent to enter a plea. After considering the defendant's responses, and observing her demeanor, a finding was made that the defendant was competent to plead and fully aware of the purpose of the hearing.

B. Maximum Penalties and Consequences of Guilty Plea

Upon questioning, the defendant expressed her understanding of the maximum penalties prescribed by statute for the offense to which she was pleading guilty, namely: a term of imprisonment of not more than two (2) years, and a fine of not more than two hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$250,000.00), or both. The defendant also understood she could be sentenced to a term of supervised release of not more than one year and that a Special Monetary Assessment of \$100.00 would be imposed, per count, to be deposited in the Crime Victim Fund, pursuant to Title 18, United States Code, §3013(a). The court explained the nature of supervised release and the consequences of revocation. The defendant indicated that she understood the maximum penalties for Count One.

USA v. Veriane Aparecida Soares-Pereira
Cr. No. 16-522 (GAG)
Report and Recommendation on Guilty Plea

The defendant was informed that parole has been abolished and that any sentence of imprisonment must be served. Defendant was additionally informed that a pre-sentence report would be prepared and considered by the district judge at sentencing. Defendant was further admonished that her guilty plea, if accepted, may deprive her of valuable civil rights, such as the right to vote, to hold public office, to serve on a jury, and to possess a firearm. The defendant also confirmed that she was aware that her guilty plea, if accepted, may result in negative immigration consequences such as removal, deportation, and prohibition of re-entry to the United States. The defendant confirmed that she understood these consequences of her guilty plea.

C. Sentencing Procedures

The defendant was specifically informed that the district court, after considering the applicable Sentencing Guidelines, could impose a sentence different from any estimate provided by her attorney, and that the court had authority to impose a sentence that is more severe or less severe than the sentence called for by the Sentencing Guidelines, and that she would not be allowed to withdraw her guilty plea for the sole reason that he received a sentence more severe than she might anticipate. The defendant was advised, and understood, that the Sentencing Guidelines are no longer mandatory and are thus considered advisory, and that during sentencing the court will consider the sentencing criteria found at 18, United States Code, Section 3553(a). The defendant was advised that under some circumstances she or the government may have the right to appeal the sentence the court imposes.

D. Waiver of Constitutional Rights

The defendant was specifically advised that she has the right to persist in a plea of not guilty, and if she does so persist that she has the right to a speedy and public trial by jury, or before

USA v. Veriane Aparecida Soares-Pereira
Cr. No. 16-522 (GAG)
Report and Recommendation on Guilty Plea

a judge sitting without a jury if the court and the government so agree; that at trial she would be presumed innocent and the government would have to prove her guilt beyond a reasonable doubt; that she would have the right to assistance of counsel for her defense, and if she could not afford an attorney the court would appoint one to represent her throughout all stages of the proceedings; that at trial she would have the right to hear and cross examine the government's witnesses, the right to decline to testify unless she voluntarily elected to do so, and the right to the issuance of subpoenas or compulsory process to compel the attendance of witnesses to testify on her behalf. She was further informed that if she decided not to testify or put on evidence at trial, her failure to do so could not be used against her, and that at trial the jury must return a unanimous verdict before she could be found guilty.

The defendant specifically acknowledged understanding these rights, and understanding that by entering a plea of guilty there would be no trial and she will be waiving or giving up the rights that the court explained.

E. Factual Basis for the Guilty Plea

Defendant was read in open court Count One of the indictment and provided an explanation of the elements of the offense. Upon questioning, the government presented to this magistrate judge and to defendant a summary of the basis in fact for the offense charged in Count One and the evidence the government had available to establish, in the event defendant elected to go to trial, the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. The defendant was able to understand this explanation and admitted to the government's submission as to the facts which could have been presented at trial.

USA v. Veriane Aparecida Soares-Pereira
Cr. No. 16-522 (GAG)
Report and Recommendation on Guilty Plea

F. Voluntariness

The defendant indicated that she was not being induced to plead guilty, but was entering such a plea freely and voluntarily because in fact she is guilty, and that no one had threatened her or offered a thing of value in exchange for her plea. She acknowledged that no one had made any promises in exchange for her guilty plea. Throughout the hearing the defendant was able to consult with her attorney.

IV. Conclusion

The defendant, by consent, appeared before me pursuant to Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, and entered a plea of guilty as to Count One of the indictment.

After cautioning and examining the defendant under oath and in open court concerning each of the subject matters mentioned in Rule 11, I find that the defendant, Veriane Aparecida Soares-Pereira, is competent to enter this guilty plea, is aware of the nature of the offense charged and the maximum statutory penalties that it carries, understands that the charge is supported by evidence and a basis in fact, has admitted to the elements of the offense, and has done so in an intelligent and voluntary manner with full knowledge of the consequences of her guilty plea. Therefore, I recommend that the court accept the guilty plea and that the defendant be adjudged guilty as to Count One of the indictment.

This report and recommendation is filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(B) and Rule 72(d) of the Local Rules of this Court. Any objections to the same must be specific and must be filed with the Clerk of Court within 14 days of its receipt. Failure to file timely and specific objections to the report and recommendation is a waiver of the right to review by the district court. United States v. Valencia-Copete, 792 F.2d 4 (1st Cir. 1986).

USA v. Veriane Aparecida Soares-Pereira
Cr. No. 16-522 (GAG)
Report and Recommendation on Guilty Plea

A sentencing hearing has been set for September 12, 2017 at 9:00 a.m. before District Judge Gustavo Gelpi.

IT IS SO RECOMMENDED.

In San Juan, Puerto Rico, this 9th day of May, 2017.

s/Bruce J. McGiverin
BRUCE J. McGIVERIN
United States Magistrate Judge